1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 6 7 PAR ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS, INC. and OLD REPUBLIC NO: 2:16-CV-0246-TOR INSURANCE COMPANY. 8 ORDER DENYING OLD REPUBLIC 9 Plaintiff, **INSURANCE COMPANY'S** MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION 10 v. 11 BLUELINE RENTAL LLC; PLATINUM EQUITY, LLC; and SANDRA HOYE, as Personal 12 Representative for the Estate of Conor J. Finnerty, and for C.F., a Minor and 13 M.F., a Minor, 14 Defendants. 15 BEFORE THE COURT is Old Republic Insurance Company's Motion for 16 Reconsideration (ECF No. 51). The Court has reviewed the record and files herein, 17 18 and is fully informed. The Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 51) is **DENIED**, 19 as Old Republic's request simply rehashes arguments that were fully considered. 20 Compare ECF No. 51 with ECF No. 47. ORDER DENYING OLD REPUBLIC INSURANCE COMPANY'S MOTION

FOR RECONSIDERATION ~ 1

DISCUSSION

"[A] motion for reconsideration should not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law." *389 Orange St. Partners v. Arnold*, 179 F.3d 656, 665 (9th Cir. 1999) (citation omitted). There is no newly discovered evidence or change in law. Old Republic has not stated how the Court committed clear error. ECF No. 51. Old Republic merely complains about the result and attempts to re-litigate the issues this Court already decided after thorough analysis. Compare ECF No. 51 with ECF No. 47. Old Republic's concern that the Court should wait to determine whether Old Republic has a duty to indemnify until a verdict is illusory—if there is no resulting liability the duty to indemnify does not materialize.

ORDER DENYING OLD REPUBLIC INSURANCE COMPANY'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION ~ 2

Old Republic complains that this Court did not follow *Ritter v. Penske Trucking Leasing Co.*, an unpublished case. ECF No. 51 at 2. The *Ritter* case does not even directly address the issue—rather, it focuses on a lack of an allegation in the underlying complaint and reasonable expectations—and its conclusion that the policy was limited to negligence was not explained or supported, contrary to the cases this Court references in its Order (ECF NO. 47). *Ritter v. Penske Trucking Leasing Co., L.P.*, 2012 WL 6049186, at 4-6 (Wisc. App. 2012).

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: Old Republic's Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 25) is **DENIED**. The District Court Executive is hereby directed to enter this Order and provide copies to counsel. **DATED** March 17, 2017. Chief United States District Judge